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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed adequately most of concerns raised with the paper.

Minor essential revision
The methods section does require further refinement. While the authors stated that the omissions in the methods section were reported elsewhere in the paper (eg discussion or introduction), these should all be included in the methods section so that readers can easily determine the approach taken without having to review the whole paper to determine what was done. For example, the IQC and EQA should appear in methods not discussion.

Working diagnosis versus confirmed diagnosis
I am still not clear what the difference between these two diagnoses are apart from a time period of 3 weeks.
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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